Remarks

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,867,535 to Phillips et al. (hereafter "the *Phillips* patent"). Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,960 to Lin (hereafter "the *Lin* patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,677 to Kumar (hereafter "the *Kumar* patent") and the *Phillips* patent. For the following reasons, these rejections are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 is Allowable Over the *Phillips* Patent

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the *Phillips* patent. Claim 2 recites "a first frequency monitor adapted to measure the frequency of said first oscillator ... a second frequency monitor adapted to measure the frequency of said second oscillator; and a computer adapted to receive the frequency measurement of said first oscillator from said first frequency monitor, [and] to receive the frequency measurement of said second oscillator from said second frequency monitor."

While the *Phillips* patent may disclose tuning of a NCO and a local oscillator using a digital signal processor, the *Phillips* patent discloses that tuning is performed using information received via a computer and a field programmable gate array, and not from a frequency monitor, as recited in independent claim 2. The *Phillips* reference simply does not disclose or suggest one frequency monitor adapted to measure the frequency of the first oscillator with a second frequency monitor adapted to measure the frequency of the second oscillator.

Accordingly, the *Phillips* patent does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 2 and the rejection is improper. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 1 is Allowable Over the *Lin* Patent in view of the *Kumar* Patent and the *Phillips*Patent

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Lin* patent when taken in view of the *Kumar* patent and the *Phillips* patent.

Claim 1 recites "a first frequency monitor adapted to measure the frequency of said first oscillator ... a second frequency monitor adapted to measure the frequency of said second oscillator ... [and] a computer adapted to receive the frequency measurement of said first oscillator from said first frequency monitor, [and] to receive the frequency measurement of said second oscillator from said second frequency monitor."

While, the *Lin* patent may disclose that a computer and an oscillator circuit may be used to drive a code NCO, the *Lin* patent does not disclose or suggest a frequency monitor adapted to measure the frequency of the first oscillator. Neither the *Lin* patent, the *Kumar* patent, nor the *Phillips* patent disclose or suggest, either explicitly or implicitly, the frequency monitor as recited in claim 2. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 is allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant(s) therefore respectfully request(s) that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant(s) believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mighael J. Bell, Esq. (Re

Andrew R. Sommer (Reg. Nd. 53,932)

Date: June 30, 2004

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP Box No. 34 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-2402 (202) 783-0800